

indeed, all over the world. It leads countries to greatness and men and women to their highest aspirations. We look forward to hearing his comments later this morning.

It is clear this body will stand by the Iraqis, will help them build a free, prosperous, and democratic Iraq. Their future, indeed, our security and the security of civilized people everywhere depends on it.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I also certainly wish the President the best of luck at the United Nations today. I think it is extremely important we have more support from the international community. I am very happy to see the President going there seeking that help.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business not to exceed 60 minutes, with Senators permitted to speak therein, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee, and the remaining 30 minutes under the control of the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, or her designee.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes on the Republican time.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I have no objection, but I will indicate that I desire to follow the distinguished Senator from Utah. I will seek recognition at that time for another 4 to 6 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator seek unanimous consent at this time?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Virginia will be recognized following the Senator from Utah.

The Senator from Utah is recognized.

A CHARGE AGAINST THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, over the weekend the country heard one of the more senior Members of this body, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, make a charge against the President of the United States, particularly with respect to the war in Iraq.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts said the war in Iraq was "hatched in Texas" in a conversation between the President of the United States and the Republican leadership and that the purpose of attacking Iraq was to help the Republicans politically in the congressional elections of 2002. The Senator from Massachusetts summarized the President's position with respect to the war in a single word. He called it a "fraud."

To quote a comment from the Washington Post in another situation dealing with Iraq, this is a serious charge and it deserves a serious response. It is my attempt today to give a serious response to this charge.

If the charge made by the senior Senator from Massachusetts is accurate, then the President is deserving of a serious rebuke. If in fact the charge is not accurate, the senior Senator from Massachusetts is deserving of a serious rebuke.

I intend to examine whether or not the charge could be substantiated and give it the attention that I think it does in fact deserve.

I will turn not to sources that are friendly to the President of the United States; I will go in my analysis to those who have been critical of President Bush with respect to Iraq and to his Presidency generally.

Let me start by quoting a Presidential statement with respect to Iraq:

Saddam Hussein's priorities are painfully clear, not caring for his citizens but building weapons of mass destruction and using them—using them not once, but repeatedly in the terrible war Iraq fought with Iran, and not only against combatants but against civilians, and not only against a foreign adversary but against his own people, and he has targeted Scud missiles against fellow Arabs in Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Bahrain.

Nobody wants to use force, but if Saddam Hussein refuses to keep his commitments to the international community, we must be prepared to deal directly with the threat these weapons pose to the Iraqi people, to Iraq's neighbors, and to the rest of the world. Either Saddam acts, or we will have to.

As I say, that was a Presidential quote, but it was not from George W. Bush, and it was not after a meeting in Texas between George W. Bush and Republican leaders. That was a statement made by President William Jefferson Clinton on February 20, 1998—long before the congressional elections of 2002 and 2 years before George W. Bush became President of the United States.

The suggestion that President Bush created the fraud or the specter that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction does not stand up against that statement by President Clinton.

I make reference to the Washington Post. This is a newspaper that is not known for its support of either Republicans or President Bush. But they were a supporter of attacking Iraq and, as I have said, there were those who charged the Washington Post editors with a "jingoistic rush to war," and the paper said, as I have noted:

That is a serious charge and it deserves a serious response.

Then the paper goes on to make these comments:

In fact, there is nothing sudden or precipitous about our view that Saddam Hussein poses a grave danger.

Quoting further:

In 1997 and 1998, we strongly backed President Clinton when he vowed that Iraq must finally honor its commitments to the United Nations to give up its nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and we strongly criticized him when he retreated from those vows.

Again, that was a comment made after the supposed meeting in Texas and made after the congressional elections of 2002. If, indeed, President Bush made the decision to go into Iraq for purely political reasons, why would the Washington Post, which is not one of President Bush's supporters, be commenting after those congressional elections in a way that makes it clear they came to the same conclusion that President Bush did?

Would the Senator from Massachusetts suggest that the Washington Post was part of the conspiracy that went on in Texas prior to the congressional elections, and that the Washington Post was complicit in the fraud visited on the American people by the decision to go ahead in Iraq?

The Post editorial goes on, and this was February 27, 2003:

When we cite Mr. Clinton's perceptive but ultimately empty comments, it is in part to chide him and other Democrats who take a different view now that a Republican is in charge. But it has a more serious purpose, too. Mr. Clinton could not muster the will, or the domestic or international support, to force Saddam Hussein to live up to the promises he had made in 1991, though even then the danger was well understood.

We need not stay within our shores to find those who believe the President made the right decision in Iraq. Let us go overseas. I had occasion to visit with a group of European Parliamentarians. One of them, who came from Great Britain, made this comment to me. He said they have never had a politician in Great Britain who is as poll-driven as Tony Blair, and they never had one who pays so much attention to focus groups. The man said Tony Blair almost allows focus groups to determine what kind of tie he will wear in the morning. Yet when we come to this Iraq business, said this particular Parliamentarian, Tony Blair is going against all of the polls and all of the focus groups. He is acting in a manner that is completely uncharacteristic for him as a politician. He is actually willing to risk his position as Prime Minister in order to make sure we go after Saddam Hussein. He said they cannot understand it, except on one possible basis, and that is that Tony Blair must be completely convinced that the information is correct, that the intelligence is right, and that Saddam Hussein does indeed pose a threat. He said that there is otherwise no explanation for the way he is behaving, that it is contrary to his entire political experience.

Would the senior Senator from Massachusetts suggest that Tony Blair was

part of a conspiracy in Texas prior to the 2002 elections, and that Tony Blair was convinced by the President of the United States he should help him win a Republican victory in the congressional elections by supporting the action in Iraq?

It is interesting when we are talking about Tony Blair we can once again turn to the words of William Jefferson Clinton. On March 18, 2003, once again, after the congressional elections had taken place, President Clinton had this to say in the *Guardian* Newspaper, published in Great Britain. He talked about those in America who were calling for action. Then he says:

On the other side, France, Germany and Russia are adamantly opposed to the use of force or imposing any ultimatum on Saddam as long as the inspectors are working. They believe that, at least as long as the inspectors are there, Iraq will not use or give away its chemical and biological stock and therefore no matter how unhelpful Saddam is, he does not pose a threat sufficient to justify invasion.

Here is President Clinton using a phrase that is now current in the Democratic Presidential race: "He does not pose a threat sufficient to justify invasion."

Then President Clinton goes on and responds to that statement by saying this:

The problem with their position is that only the threat of force from the US and the UK got inspectors back into Iraq in the first place. Without a credible threat of force, Saddam will not disarm.

Then President Clinton goes on to conclude:

If we leave Iraq with chemical and biological weapons, after 12 years of defiance, there is a considerable risk that one day these weapons will fall into the wrong hands and put many more lives at risk than will be lost in overthrowing Saddam.

... Prime Minister Blair will have to do what he believes to be right. I trust him to do that and hope the labor MP's and the British people will, too.

This is President Clinton supporting Prime Minister Blair in his support of President Bush after the congressional elections of 2002 have taken place.

Are we suggesting again that President Clinton and Prime Minister Blair and the *Washington Post* were all part of the conspiracy to perpetuate a fraud on the American people? I don't think so.

Now, I come to my final comment that I wish to make, again, from a source not friendly to the President. Once again, it is the *Washington Post*. I began with them and I shall conclude with them. This is an editorial published on August 10, 2003, almost a year after the congressional elections are over. They are referring to a speech made by the former Vice President, Al Gore:

The notion—that we were all somehow bamboozled into war—is part of Mr. Gore's larger conviction that Mr. Bush has put one over on the nation, and not just with regard to Iraq.

That is essentially what the senior Senator from Massachusetts said, and

which the former Vice President said, and the *Washington Post* repeats that. This is the comment they make, referring to that proposal President Bush "put one over on the nation."

The *Washington Post* says of that idea that it is:

... one that many Americans might find a tad insulting: The administration has developed a highly effective propaganda machine to embed in the public mind mythologies ...

Again, that is Vice President Gore's comment, and that was the gist of what the senior Senator from Massachusetts said.

Back to the *Washington Post*:

Thus, Mr. Gore maintains, we were all under the "false impression" that Saddam Hussein was "on the verge of building nuclear bombs," that he was "about to give the terrorists poison gas and deadly germs," that he was partly responsible for the 9/11 attacks. And because of these "false impressions," the nation didn't conduct a proper debate about the war. But there was extensive debate going back many years; last fall and winter the nation debated little else. Mr. Bush took his case to the United Nations. Congress argued about and approved a resolution authorizing war. And the approval did not come, as Mr. Gore and other Democrats now maintain, because people were deceived into believing that Saddam Hussein was an "imminent" threat who had attacked the World Trade Center or was about to do so.

They conclude:

It would certainly be fair now to argue that the logic was wrong. There was a cogent case to be made against the war, and even those who supported it might now say that the absence of any uncovered weapons of mass destruction, or the continuing violence against Americans, gives them, in hindsight, a different view. There's plenty to criticize in the administration's postwar effort, too. What isn't persuasive, or even very smart politically, is to pretend to have been fooled by what Mr. Gore breathlessly calls the Bush "systematic effort to manipulate facts ..."

From these sources outside of the Republican base and outside of the administration, it is clear the senior Senator from Massachusetts has made a charge he cannot substantiate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first, I compliment my distinguished colleague from Utah. The Bennett family has given two generations of service to the Senate, and the Senator can speak with a background and understanding of this institution and a conscience for this institution to follow. I commend my distinguished colleague.

I join this morning in speaking out about this situation, and indeed, if I may say, the responsibility of this Chamber, each individually and collectively, as we deal with these issues. I have been privileged to be a member of this Chamber for a quarter of a century. I, too, was gravely concerned to hear remarks from several of our colleagues regarding criticism of this operation in Iraq. Criticism is welcome. Our President welcomes it. It is freedom of speech. But there seems to be a responsibility, if you criticize, answer

the question, Are we as a nation—is the world better off today, having deposed Saddam Hussein and his regime of terrorism, or should we have left it as it was?

That question has to be answered by those who wish to employ this strident rhetoric, but they fail to do so.

Throughout the military history of this country, from World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, Afghanistan, Iraq, our military planners have done their best—a clear victory in World War I, a clear victory in World War II, an indecisive conclusion in Korea—still there is no armistice as such—and an indecisive and somewhat tragic conclusion in Vietnam. So as we look at the records in Afghanistan, militarily, it clearly was a success. Could the planning have been more comprehensive? Possibly so. And there will come a time—and I wish to stress that—there will come a time when this Chamber and the House of Representatives and the Congress as a whole can determine the accountability for these operations.

At this time, our focus should be behind the Commander in Chief, our President, who at this very moment is addressing the United Nations on the policies and the goals of our Nation working with a coalition of forces in Iraq.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WARNER. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senator is the military historian and has served as Secretary of the Navy. Could the Senator confirm my recollection that General Eisenhower once said, before the attack: The plan is everything? After the attack starts, the plan goes out the window.

Is that a correct quote? And does that apply in this situation?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I think that carefully paraphrases what that brilliant strategist and President said. There is no doubt about it. And there will be a time to determine what went right, what did not go according to plan, and such deficiencies, and the accountability. But right now our obligation is owing to the men and the women who are fighting there and their families at home. Stop to think of the reaction of a young wife, surrounded by small children, not knowing from day to day whether her husband will survive another day's engagement in Afghanistan or Iraq, and they hear this whole thing has been a fraud perpetrated upon this family and was made up in Texas. I find that very painful.

I have had the privilege of almost a lifetime of association with the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States—over half a century. Modest was my contribution on active duty, but through this half century I have learned much from these men and women with whom I have been privileged to work and support now as a Member of the Senate.

We always have to focus on that family and their reaction to every word we say on this floor, every word that is said in the Congress. How does it affect that young wife or spouse of a female serving in uniform, as many are in these troubled areas of the world? How is that family affected, and not only the children but the parents?

By and large, people who go into uniform do so solely for patriotism. It is an all-volunteer force. There is no draft. No one is compelled to do this. They volunteer. They volunteer as a consequence of the inspiration of their older brothers and sisters, their fathers, their uncles, their grandfathers who have served in previous military conflicts.

They look upon the Congress as that bastion that safeguards—safeguards—those who are put in harm's way. I ask, do these comments constitute embracing, as we should, those families, those children? Is that safeguarding those put in harm's way? I say no.

I simply say the goal of this operation in Iraq and the goal of the operation in Afghanistan is to bring to those troubled regions of the world, at long last, a measure of freedom for the peoples of those nations, a measure of their ability to govern themselves.

I am proud the United States, behind our President, has taken that leadership to bring about that measure of freedom and democracy in those foreign lands. Yes, each of us is paying by the loss of life, the loss of limb, but history will record, in this hour of world history, America stands strong. It is committed to its goals. I am confident this body will support our President on measures that he needs to fulfill these objectives.

The decision to confront Saddam Hussein was not without careful deliberation, extensive diplomacy, and substantial effort to find a peaceful solution. It had been the conclusion of three consecutive American administrations, countless other nations, and the United Nations that Saddam Hussein's Iraqi regime had weapons of mass destruction, had used them on his own people and neighboring countries, and was a clear and present danger to regional and world peace. It had been the conclusion of the Clinton administration that Saddam Hussein had stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction, was actively seeking more, and would ultimately use them again. The United Nations Security Council had passed 17 resolutions, stretching back to 1991—12 years—requiring full cooperation in disarming itself of weapons of mass destruction. Saddam Hussein's response was defiance and deception.

In October 2002, after an unprecedented amount of debate, the Senate voted 77-23 to authorize the President to use force in Iraq. The House of Representatives also voted overwhelmingly in favor of authorizing the use of force. By that act, it became our war and the American people's war, not the

President's war. At this critical juncture, it is our responsibility to provide the resources necessary to finish the job.

American armed forces, joined by a robust coalition, achieved extraordinary, rapid military success in Iraq, with minimum casualties and damage. This is a clear tribute to the professionalism and dedication of our young men and women in uniform and those who support them. We have succeeded in ridding the world of a brutal tyrant and have revealed the extent of his barbarism. We should be congratulating our President and our armed forces on a job well done, not criticizing and undermining their heroic efforts.

Extensive planning was done for combat operations, as well as post conflict stability operations. We all know that no plan survives its initial confrontation with reality on the battlefield. Plans must be flexible and adapt to conditions as they are encountered. No one could have anticipated the complete disintegration of Iraqi security and governance institutions. No one knew how badly the Iraqi infrastructure had deteriorated under Saddam Hussein's 30-plus years of mismanagement.

American forces and coalition partners have done a remarkable job of restoring basic services, rebuilding schools and hospitals, preventing ethnic violence and creating an environment where reconstruction can succeed. This is being done in a difficult environment of harsh conditions and significant risk, as those who have been removed from power seek to delay inevitable defeat and as terrorists lash out at the loss of another haven.

What is the best way to reduce U.S. casualties and create the conditions for withdrawing U.S. troops? The key is to improve the security situation by restoring essential services, recruiting and training dependable, indigenous Iraqi security forces, and repairing the infrastructure so that real economic growth and opportunity can flourish. The emergency supplemental request of \$87 billion submitted by President Bush specifically addresses this need.

It is imperative that we give our President and our troops the resources they need to complete their missions in Iraq and Afghanistan. The faster the money gets to these countries, the faster conditions will improve, and the faster our troops will come home. We must, and we will, stay the course and achieve our goals. This is also a clear message of support and resolve to our troops, their families, and the neighborhoods and communities that support them.

Lasting peace and security in Iraq will be achieved when we establish the environment for a democratic, economically viable Iraq. The supplemental request now before the Congress will ensure such an environment and is the best path to the earliest possible return of our troops. Half a century ago, the Marshall plan brought

peace and prosperity to a war-ravaged continent. That modest investment has been repaid a hundredfold or more. The funding we are being asked to provide for this important region is an equally important investment that will, likewise, be repaid many times over in the decades to come. I urge my colleagues to support and rapidly approve the President's request and send a message of overwhelming bipartisan support to our troops, and to all American citizens, of the need to stay the course and secure this important victory in the war on terrorism.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENSIGN). The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, it was my understanding that the Democratic side had from 9:30 to 10, and the Republican side from 10 to 10:30. Could you clarify where we stand at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There were 60 minutes divided starting at 9:38 a.m. Currently on the majority side there are 6½ minutes; on the minority side there are 7 minutes 40 seconds.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I would like to ask, then, that the minority take its time, after which I would like to reserve the remainder of our time for Senator SANTORUM.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are not going to take our time now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, let me clarify that. What is the status, then, of the minority's time allocation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have 7 minutes 41 seconds. The majority has 6 minutes 25 seconds.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, it was my understanding that—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no agreement. The time is just equally divided.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. May I ask the distinguished minority leader what his intentions are, then, with regard to the minority time, because we had thought we had a division that is the tradition here where the minority takes the last 30 minutes on one day and then the majority the next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is correct. What happened this morning is the majority went ahead of their normal time. I say to my friend, the Senator from Texas, we are going to ask for more time, anyway. Quite frankly, we didn't know when morning business was scheduled that the purpose was to attack another Senator. Based upon that, we are going to ask, when all time expires, for more time. So we should all have time to state our respective positions.

We have a number of Senators who are on their way to the Chamber now. Senator DODD is here now to say a word regarding the statements that have been made by the majority. So we are going to ask for more time.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, in that case, I will withhold for our majority leader to make a decision about what the time allocation would be, and I yield up to 5 minutes to Senator SANTORUM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President. And I thank the Senator from Texas.

Having reflected on this debate on Iraq and postwar Iraq, a lot of what I am hearing—the rhetoric I am hearing about this administration not having a plan, this administration not preparing for all the contingencies, this administration not having an exit strategy or an end strategy—reminds me of a couple of things. No. 1, it reminds me about the same people making the same criticism about the same administration about a month into the war that the generals didn't consider all the different problems they were going to confront, they didn't have a plan, didn't have an exit strategy, et cetera—and then 2 weeks later the war was over.

I am not suggesting that 2 weeks from now everything in Iraq is going to be settled, but this idea that every contingency had to be considered is ridiculous. No one is smart enough anywhere to consider every contingency. What you are smart enough to do is put a basic game plan in place, and then, as things develop, have that game plan flexible enough to adjust and meet those contingencies. It is exactly what Tommy Franks did when he put the game plan together for the war in Iraq. As things changed and developed, as new things came up, they adjusted. It is exactly what is going on with Jerry Bremer over in Iraq today.

I also harken back to postwar Germany after World War II. A lot of analogies are being made by both sides about the importance of this reconstruction of Iraq as was the reconstruction of the Axis powers after World War II. I remind my colleagues that this plan Truman gets a lot of credit for, Marshall gets a lot of credit for, was not in place until 2 years—2 years—after Germany fell. It was not passed in the Congress until 3 years after Germany fell.

I remind my colleagues of some of the comments some Members of this body made and some Members of the House made back then. A House Member, a Mr. Vursell, from Illinois, said—this is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—

There is little question in my mind but that the launching of the Marshall plan asking 16 nations to gather in conference and determine how much aid they needed from the United States was a colossal blunder in the very beginning.

Does this sound familiar—"a colossal blunder"?

He said:

It will be less disastrous to this country if the Members of this Congress will now take over and have the courage to try to salvage what we can in the interest of our Government and the [American] people.

Now you are hearing the same thing today.

History proved that great leadership and great vision have their place in the world. Sometimes Members of Congress, with very narrow vision and very parochial interests, don't necessarily do what is in the best interest of the Nation or the best interest of the world.

What the President is doing is providing true leadership at a time when leadership is at a premium. He provided in the Iraq war a great plan. He stuck to it in spite of criticism and followed that plan to its successful conclusion.

There were speeches in the Senate, both sides of the aisle, about how difficult not the war was going to be but how difficult postwar Iraq was going to be, that it would be the difficult and long challenge. Yet here we are a few months afterwards and we are already carping, saying it is not finished, it has not been accomplished. Yet by every measure, we are doing much better in postwar Iraq than they did with the most successful reconstruction plan in the history of the world, the Marshall plan. We are moving forward with economic reforms, currency reforms, banking reforms, money to be put in to restore their infrastructure at a much faster and more effective rate than what occurred after World War II. This is a plan that needs time to work.

I understand the pressures of the 24-hour news cycle. Thankfully, in 1947 they didn't have that. But we have it today. And so the need is always immediate. There can be no room for delay or failure. We are in a push-button world, and we have to solve the problems today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, what is the status of the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute 14 seconds left.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. For the majority side. And how much on the minority side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes 41 seconds.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I am going to use the 1 minute 14 seconds to say that there is one thing I must object to that was said recently by Senator KENNEDY, when he said that the war is "a fraud that was made up in Texas to give the President a political boost." I have great respect for Senator KENNEDY and every Senator who represents his or her State in this body. But that is a slur on my home State of Texas, to say this plot was made up in Texas.

I remind the people of America that Texas is a patriotic State, that Texas has 1 in 10 Active-Duty military. On the very day that statement was made, a plot in Texas to help a political campaign of a President, in fact, on that very day, three Texas soldiers were ambushed in Iraq and lost their lives serving our country. Those are great Tex-

ans. The 4th Infantry Division from Fort Hood, TX, is there now, as we speak.

As I traveled through Afghanistan and Iraq, I met Texans who were serving their country. I don't think there should ever be a slur on another State when we are talking about foreign policy or the policies of a President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ATTACK ON SENATOR KENNEDY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I know we are still negotiating with regard to the schedule for the course of the next hour or so. We will ask for some additional time to respond to this attack on Senator KENNEDY. I believe this is getting to be a real practice here. I was the brunt of similar criticism last spring. It seems as if anyone who comes to the floor to express concern or to express his or her views on Iraq is now the subject of attack.

Regardless of one's views, to impugn someone's patriotism, to question the motives, to challenge the integrity is wrong. We ought to have an opportunity to have an open, candid expression of views without challenging—

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am going to finish my statement and I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

We ought to have an opportunity to have this open discussion and expression of views without challenging the motives, the patriotism, or the very right of any Senator to express him or herself. Senator KENNEDY did that. Many of us have done that now over the course of the debate. We may ultimately come to different conclusions about what the facts are or about the specific policies involving Iraq or our involvement in the questions we are facing right now with regard to the \$87 billion. But I must say, let's keep this an open and fair discussion of the facts, without always impugning someone's integrity or personal motivation.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah. I am told we only have a couple minutes left. Until we reach agreement, I will yield at this time to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I asked unanimous consent that the exchange between the Democratic leader and myself not be charged to their time, if he would be willing to yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Does the Senator yield for a question?